GRANTED. DENIED. X There is no legal retiring IT IS SO ORDERED. To remarde Gruns relieved IT IS SO ORDERED.

U.S. District Judge 

1.5. District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
2010 OCT - 1 AM 11: 44

CHRISTOPHER META	) CASE NO. 4:14-cv-085 YELAND
Plaintiff,	) CASE NO. 4:14-cv-0852cc And
,,	) JUDGE DONALD V. NUGENT
v.	)
TARGET CORP., et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

OBJECTOR ERICH NEUMANN'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION; OR, ALTERNATIVELY, FED. R. APP. P. 8(a)(1)(A) MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL OR STAY PENDING FURTHER DISCOVERY

Class Member and Objector Erich Neumann ("Neumann"), moves this Court for reconsideration of its September 24, 2018 Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for a Bond to Secure Payment of Costs and Attorneys' Fees on Appeal, ECF No. 188 ("Order"). The Court's Order as applied against Neumann appears to have been based in part on a good-faith but mistaken finding that Mr. Neumann had not timely filed his opposition brief; and said Order did not consider the arguments and factual evidence presented in the opposition brief. For this and other reasons provided in the following memorandum in support, this Motion for Reconsideration should be granted.

Alternatively, the undersigned seeks a Motion to Stay the Order against Objector Neumann, pursuant to FeD. R. App. P. 8(a)(1)(A). In a further alternative, Neumann suggests that any order for Neumann to pay a bond should be stayed pending discovery of his ability to pay.